

Patent Attorney's Docket No. <u>029150-116</u>

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Pate	ent Application of)	NON-FEE RESPONSE	
Bertus Ka	arel EDENS)	Group Art Unit: 3653	
Application	on No.: 10/032,104)	Examiner: J. Shapiro	
Filed: De	ecember 31, 2001)	Confirmation No.: 6139	
	RODUCTION OF MAIL PIECES AND) REPARATIONS THEREFOR)		
	REPLY TRANSMIT	TAL LETTER	
P.O. Box	ioner for Patents 1450 ia, VA 22313-1450	RECEIVED OCT. 8 9 2003 application.	
Sir:		RECE 2003	
Encle	osed is a reply for the above-identified patent	application.	
[]	A Petition for Extension of Time is also end	SUMP A	
[]	A Terminal Disclaimer and the [] \$55.00 (37 C.F.R. § 1.20(d) are also enclosed.		
[]	Also enclosed is/are		
[]	Small entity status is hereby claimed.		
[]	Applicant(s) requests continued examination [] \$385.00 (2801) [] \$770.00 (1801) fee		
	[] Applicant(s) requests that any previous entered. Continued examination is requidentified above.	ly unentered after final amendments <u>not</u> be uested based on the enclosed documents	
	[] Applicant(s) previously submitted for which continued examination is rec	uested., on,	
•	which does not exceed three months fr	ion by the Office until at least, om the filing of this RCE, in accordance with the under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(i) is enclosed.	
[]	A Request for Entry and Consideration of S (1809/2809) is also enclosed.	submission under 37 C.F.R. § 1.129(a)	

Amendment/Reply Transmittal Letter
Application No. 10/032,104
Attorney's Docket No. 029150-116
Page 2

[X] No additional claim fee is required.

[] An additional claim fee is required, and is calculated as shown below:

	No. Of CLAIMS	A M E N D E D HIGHEST NO. OF CLAIMS PREVIOUSLY PAID FOR	EXTRA CLAIMS	RATE	ADD'L FEE
Total Claims	18	MINUS 20 =	0	× \$18.00 (1202) =	0.00
Independent Claims	3	MINUS 3 =	0	× \$86.00 (1201) =	0.00
If Amendment adds multiple dependent claims, add \$290.00 (1203)				0.00	
Total Claim Amendment Fee					0.00
If small entity status is claimed, subtract 50% of Total Claim Amendment Fee 0					0.00
ŤOŤAL ĀDDIŤIONĀ	L'CLAIM F	EE DUE FOR TH	IS AMENDM	ENT	

[]	A total fe	e in the	amount of	\$	_ is enclosed.
[]	Charge \$		to Dep	osit Account	No. 02-4800.

The Director is hereby authorized to charge any appropriate fees under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16, 1.17, 1.20(d) and 1.21 that may be required by this paper, and to credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 02-4800. This paper is submitted in duplicate.

Respectfully submitted,

BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.

Date: October 27, 2003

Matthew L. Schneider Registration No. 32,814

P.O. Box 1404 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404 (703) 836-6620



Patent Attorney's Docket No. <u>029150-116</u>

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of)
Bertus Karel EDENS) Group Art Unit: 3653
Application No.: 10/032,104) Examiner: J. Shapiro
Filed: December 31, 2001) Confirmation No.: 6139
For: PRODUCTION OF MAIL PIECES AND)

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

Commissioner for Patents
P. O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

PREPARATIONS THEREFOR

Sir:

In response to the Official Action dated September 26, 2003, the following remarks are submitted.

The aforementioned Official Action indicates that the claims in this application are directed to two different inventions. As identified in the Official Action, the two inventions are as follows.

Group I invention recited in Claims 1-8 directed to a method of mail production including scanning, inspecting and classifying postal items by physical property of said postal items.

Group II invention set forth in Claims 9-18 directed to a computer controlled mail sorting apparatus.

Based on the observation that the two inventions are distinct from one another, a restriction requirement has been imposed requiring an election of one of the two inventions.

Applicants hereby elect, with traverse, the Group II invention recited in Claims 9-18.

The election of the Group II invention is made with traverse because it is believed that all of the claims of this application can be examined at the same time without serious burden. While it is recognized that the two inventions may be separately classified, it is believed that the search required for the elected invention set forth in Claims 9-18 would likely extend into those areas where the non-elected invention would be searched. In addition, examining the claims directed to the non-elected invention in addition to those directed to the elected invention would only involve consideration of several additional claims.

In addition, the Official Action notes that the Group I and Group II inventions are distinct because the method as claimed can be practiced by hand. However, the claimed method involves a method for producing mail pieces in a mail production apparatus. It is not clear how the claimed method for producing mail pieces in a mail production apparatus can be practiced by hand.

In light of the foregoing, withdrawal of the restriction requirement, and examination of all of the claims of this application, including Claims 9-18 directed to the elected invention, are respectfully requested.

Application No. 10/032,104 Attorney Docket No. 029150-116 Page 3

Should any questions arise in connection with this application, the undersigned respectfully requests that he be contacted at the number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.

Date: October 27, 2003 ~

Matthew L. Schneider Registration No. 32,814

P. O. Box 1404 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404 (703) 836-6620